

IN THE DRAWINGS

Replacement drawings for FIGS. 7B and 12B correct a typographical error, wherein all erroneous occurrences of element number "64f" are replaced with "60f" in both figures. No new matter is added. Support for the corrections is self-evident from the respective figures.

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 12-19 stand withdrawn as non-elected and are hereby cancelled without prejudice for presentation in a divisional application.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 20 are rejected.

Claims 2, 6 and 11 are objected to.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 20 are amended.

Claims 2 and 6 are cancelled in favor of amending claims 1 and 5, respectively, to an allowable condition.

No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 20 remain in the case for consideration.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 6, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims.

Specification

The title has been amended to delete reference to a fabricating method, in consideration of claims withdrawn that are directed to such method.

Drawings

FIGS. 7B and 12B have been amended to correct typographical errors. All erroneous occurrences of element number "64F" are replaced with "60F" in both figures. No new matter is added. Support for the corrections is self-evident from the respective figures.

Informalities

Claim 1 has been amended to improve punctuation and format. This amendment does not result in any substantive change. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2 and 6 are cancelled in favor of amending claims 1 and 5, respectively, to an allowable condition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by PIO et al., U.S. Pat. 5,894,146 ("Pio").

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1 and 5 have each been amended to include all of the limitations of claims 2 and 6, respectively. The Examiner has noted that claims 2 and 6 are allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims. This has been done. Therefore, applicants request withdrawal of the rejections for claims 1 and 5, as well as for their respective dependent claims.

Claim 20 has been amended to add a limitation directed to the inter-gate dielectric extending from only one of two sidewalls of the gate line. No new matter is added. Support can be found for these amendments throughout the Specification, including FIGS. 7B and 12B.


Pio does not show an intergate dielectric that is narrower than the width of a bottom gate or selection line *and* extending from only one sidewall of a gate line.

Thus, Pio does not teach every element of claim 20. For at least this reason, applicants request withdrawal of the rejections for this claim.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 20 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.


Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee, Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number (571)-273-8300, on August 18, 2005.



Li Mei Vermilya